

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Iowa

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Iowa. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, **IA**, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via State Offices on 3 Nov 2005, and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received in Iowa, 4334 of a possible 5280 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .821, for a rating of 82.1%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around color quality/resolution, not being able to discern particular crops from others, and timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below: Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q7, “Is the imagery useful for government coordination, for example, in communications with other Federal, State or local agencies?” Statistically, the highest scoring questions were Q1 and Q4, “Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?” and “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?” respectively.

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	4.273684211	Mean	4.106382979	Mean	4.212765957	Mean	4.279569892	Mean	3.883333333
Standard Error	0.089094116	Standard Error	0.096220127	Standard Error	0.093083064	Standard Error	0.086980397	Standard Error	0.109161329
Median	5	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	4
Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	0.868382028	Standard Deviation	0.932888739	Standard Deviation	0.902473786	Standard Deviation	0.838808568	Standard Deviation	0.845560022
Sample Variance	0.754087346	Sample Variance	0.8702814	Sample Variance	0.814458934	Sample Variance	0.703599813	Sample Variance	0.714971751
Kurtosis	-0.332366905	Kurtosis	0.508708488	Kurtosis	0.840749286	Kurtosis	1.850377766	Kurtosis	-0.221817371
Skewness	-0.865388012	Skewness	-0.94649246	Skewness	-1.065017599	Skewness	-1.248326203	Skewness	-0.468119141
Range	3	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	3
Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	406	Sum	386	Sum	396	Sum	398	Sum	233
Count	95	Count	94	Count	94	Count	93	Count	60
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	4.197802198	Mean	3.779411765	Mean	3.977011494	Mean	8.127659574	Mean	8.23655914
Standard Error	0.096608901	Standard Error	0.120077507	Standard Error	0.103373997	Standard Error	0.188453011	Standard Error	0.190590879
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	8	Median	8
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	8	Mode	10
Standard Deviation	0.921590174	Standard Deviation	0.990184488	Standard Deviation	0.964208453	Standard Deviation	1.82711973	Standard Deviation	1.837991871
Sample Variance	0.849328449	Sample Variance	0.98046532	Sample Variance	0.929697942	Sample Variance	3.338366507	Sample Variance	3.378214119
Kurtosis	1.5544129	Kurtosis	-0.425956067	Kurtosis	-0.120046184	Kurtosis	0.591742665	Kurtosis	0.528319376
Skewness	-1.191099551	Skewness	-0.392788403	Skewness	-0.670270854	Skewness	-0.906168266	Skewness	-0.926363651
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	382	Sum	257	Sum	346	Sum	764	Sum	766
Count	91	Count	68	Count	87	Count	94	Count	93

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

